



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,862	02/16/2001	Rocky Stewart	BEAS-01033US6 SRM/KFK	6339
23910	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			LIN, WEN TAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,862

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-11 and 14-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-11 and 14-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/6/05

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-11 and 14-28 are presented for examination. Claims 27-28 are newly added.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 9-10 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, claims 9 and 19 require an integration mechanism that *allows the enterprise workflow to modify an active participant workflow process* and claims 10 and 20 requires *said integration mechanism allows a participant workflow to modify an active enterprise workflow process*. While the specification teaches that a workflow process can be easily modified to reflect a company's changing business model, add new elements such as new product lines, and to account for new

events as they occur (see e.g., paragraph 83 of Applicant's specification), the modifications here are perceived as performed when the underlying workflow is inactive, instead of having one active workflow modifying another active workflow as claimed herein.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 14-18 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notani et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 6397192].

5. As to claim 1, Notani teaches the invention as claimed including: a workflow integration system for a collaboration system that allows for sharing of workflow information among a plurality of collaboration participants [e.g., Fig.5; col.col.5, lines 44-56; Fig.14; col.15, lines 30-48], comprising:

a plurality of collaboration participants [e.g., 240, 242, Fig.14; col.15, lines 30-48];

a workflow server on each collaboration participant [e.g.,col.2, lines 16-30], and having stored thereon a participant workflow, wherein said participant workflow specifies the process information for a project that is local to that collaboration participant, wherein a project is a group of related tasks[col.5, lines 17-33; col.6, lines 15-41; col.12, lines 7-18];

a collaboration server [e.g., the global collaboration manager; col.5, lines 17-33] having stored thereon and managing an enterprise workflow [i.e., a global workflow] that defines combined process information for the participant workflows and that facilitates conversations spanning those collaboration participants, wherein said enterprise workflow includes a group of

tasks executed by the collaboration server across the plurality of collaboration participants to achieve a combined result [col.6, lines 15-41] and,

an integration logic that allows one of said participant workflows to interact with another participant workflow by sending messages from one collaboration participant to another via the collaboration server in accordance with the enterprise workflow, to affect the local projects running thereon [Figs. 10-14; col.14, lines 52-67; col.18, lines 42-64; Fig.2; col.4, lines 17-41].

6. As to claim 4, Notani further teaches that the enterprise workflow is stored in the collaborative server [e.g., 10, Fig.2, wherein the GCM 8 is considered a controller of the collaboration] and that the enterprise workflow and the participant workflow may interact through exchange of XML data [col.7, lines 35-44].

7. As to claim 5, Notani further teaches that the enterprise workflow includes at least one process flow lane for each active collaboration participant, and the action of the enterprise workflow is determined by messages sent to and received from each of said active collaboration participants [e.g., Figs. 10-14].

8. As to claim 6, Notani further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages directly from the participant [e.g., 34, 37, Fig.5]

9. As to claim 7, Notani further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages from the participant workflow [e.g., 32, Fig.5].

10. As to claim 8, Notani further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages from the participant workflow via a collaboration enabler authorized to communicate with the collaboration server [col.11, lines 5-17].

11. As to claim 25, Notani further teaches that the enterprise workflow and the participant workflows are active before interacting with each other [e.g., 240, 242, Fig. 14; col.15, lines 30-48; i.e., both workflows are active starting at stage 70 before interacting at stages 71 and 75, respectively].

12. As to claims 11, 14-18, 21-24 and 26-28, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1, 4-8 and 25, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1, 4-8 and 25 above.

13. Claims 9-10 and 19-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**14.** A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

### ***Conclusion***

**Examiner note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(571) 273-8300 for official communications; and


(571) 273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

August 21, 2005

  
8/22/05